

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-1371**

---

VERONICA MOODY JOHNSON; CHRISTOPHER LEE  
JOHNSON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

CITY OF CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA, A Municipal Corporation, Itself; CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA, in its official capacity; WILLIAM E. WARD; DALTON S. EDGE; JOHN A. COSGROVE; JOHN M. DE TRIQUET; ALAN P. KRASNOFF; DWIGHT M. PARKER; WILLIAM H. PIERCE; GENE A. WATERS; DEBBIE RITTER, In their individual and official capacities as members of the City Council of the City of Chesapeake, Virginia; PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA, In its official capacity; RODNEY L. FOSTER, In his individual and official capacity as a member of the Planning Commission of the City of Chesapeake; CLIFTON D. CABARRAS, In his official capacity as a member of the Planning Commission of the City of Chesapeake, Virginia; EDWARD L. HALL, In his official capacity as a member of the Planning Commission of the City of Chesapeake, Virginia; FRANKIE W. CARROLL; BRYAN L. COLLINS; SANNNY S. DAVENPORT; LARRY W. RADFORD; GLADYS A. WILFORE; THOMAS T. WINBORNE, In their individual and official capacities as members of the Planning Commission of the City of Chesapeake, Virginia,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District Judge. (CA-99-736-2)

---

Submitted: October 23, 2002

Decided: November 7, 2002

---

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Veronica Moody Johnson, Christopher Lee Johnson, Appellants Pro Se. Thomas Jeffrey Salb, Darlene Paige Bradberry, BREEDEN, SALB, BEASLEY & DUVAL, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Veronica Moody Johnson and Christopher Lee Johnson appeal the district court's orders: (1) granting the Defendants' motion to dismiss in part; and (2) granting the Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismissing their civil action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Johnson v. City of Chesapeake, No. CA-99-736-2 (E.D. Va. Aug. 10, 2001 & March 11, 2002). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED